

TRAXCELL TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

NOKIA SOLUTIONS AND NETWORKS  
US LLC, NOKIA SOLUTIONS AND  
NETWORKS OY, NOKIA  
CORPORATION, NOKIA  
TECHNOLOGIES OY, ALCATEL-  
LUCENT USA, INC., HMD GLOBAL, T-  
MOBILE USA, INC.,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:18-CV-00412-RWS-RSP

Before the Court is Defendant T-Mobile's Motion to Dismiss for failure to state a claim. Docket No. 33. The Court previously referred this matter to Magistrate Judge Payne, for consideration pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and (3) and the Amended Order for the Adoption of Local Rules for the Assignment of Duties to United States Magistrate Judges.

The Magistrate Judge entered a Report and Recommendation (Docket No. 74) recommending the motion be denied. Defendant has not objected to the report. Accordingly, Defendant is not entitled to *de novo* review by the District Judge of those findings, conclusions and recommendations, and except upon grounds of plain error, the parties are not entitled to appellate review of the unobjected to factual findings and legal conclusions accepted and adopted by the district court. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n.*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1995) (en banc).

Nonetheless, the Court has reviewed the pleadings in the cause and agrees with the Report

of the Magistrate Judge. *See United States v. Raddatz*, 447 U.S. 667, 683 (1980) (“[T]he statute permits the district court to give to the magistrate’s proposed findings of fact and recommendations ‘such weight as [their] merit commands and the sound discretion of the judge warrants . . . .’”) (quoting *Mathews v. Weber*, 23 U.S. 261, 275 (1976)). It is accordingly

**ORDERED** that the Report of the Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 74) is **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the District Court and Defendant’s motion to dismiss (Docket No. 33) is **DENIED**.

**It is so ORDERED.**

**SIGNED this 11th day of December, 2019.**

  
ROBERT W. SCHROEDER III  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE